arXiv:1210.0644v3 [quant-ph] 22 Nov 2012

Sums of product operators that remain product operators

Scott M. Cohen*
Department of Physics, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 97201
(Dated: November 26, 2012)

We give a necessary condition that a sum of product operators is itself a product operator. This condition turns out to have a variety of useful and interesting applications in the field of quantum information, including a characterization of separable quantum channels and a constraint on when an operator sum representation of a separable quantum channel in terms of product operators is a unique product representation. By the Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism, the latter constraint translates to a condition on the uniqueness of product state ensembles for a given quantum state.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Ac

I. INTRODUCTION

Sums of product operators appear throughout quantum information theory when studying systems involving two or more parties. For example, the quantum state of a multipartite system, as described by a density operator, is defined to be separable — and therefore, *not entangled* — if and only if it can be represented as a sum of tensor products of positive operators, each positive operator acting on the Hilbert space describing one of the subsystems.

As another example, the evolution of quantum systems can be described by a set $\{K_j\}$ known as Kraus operators [1], and the evolution is that of a quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$, with

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} K_j \rho K_j^\dagger, \tag{1}$$

where ρ is the initial state of the system. A fundamental condition on these sets of Kraus operators is that they must satisfy closure,

$$I = \sum_j K_j^\dagger K_j. \tag{2}$$

When the system consists of many spatially separated subsystems, the K_j will generally be tensor products of operators acting on the individual parts, in which case the channel is referred to as "separable". Then, (2) involves a sum of product operators equal to a product operator, since the identity operator I is itself a product.

The main focus of the present paper is to study conditions under which a sum of product operators remains a product operator. To gain some intuition into this question, consider

$$\mathcal{S} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_j \otimes B_j. \tag{3}$$

This is clearly a product operator if all the A_j are proportional to each other, $A_j = c_j A_1$, such that

$$\mathcal{S} = A_1 \otimes \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j B_j. \tag{4}$$

Notice that in this case the set $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^N$ spans a one-dimensional space, so that if δ_A is the dimension of the span of these operators, with a similar definition for δ_B, then $\delta_A + \delta_B = \delta_B + 1 \leq N + 1$.

---

*Electronic address: cohensm52@gmail.com

What happens if $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^N$ spans a two-dimensional space? Then if, for example, A_1 and A_2 are linearly independent, then $A_j = c_j A_1 + c'_j A_2$ and

$$\mathcal{S} = A_1 \otimes \sum_{j=1}^N c_j B_j + A_2 \otimes \sum_{j=1}^N c'_j B_j. \tag{5}$$

This is a product operator if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^N c_j B_j$ is proportional to $\sum_{j=1}^N c'_j B_j$. Given that sets $\{c_j\}$ and $\{c'_j\}$ are strictly different ($c_1 = 1$, $c_2 = 0$, $c'_1 = 0$, $c'_2 = 1$), this constraint implies the $\{B_j\}_{j=1}^N$ cannot span a space of dimension greater than $N-1$ and $\delta_A + \delta_B \leq 2 + N - 1 = N + 1$.

In the next section, amongst other results, we will show that quite generally,

$$\delta_A + \delta_B \leq N + 1, \tag{6}$$

and we will also generalize this result to any number of parties. In Section III, we will see examples in the field of quantum information theory where these ideas prove useful. Note that throughout this paper, we will assume that all operators act on (or states reside within) finite dimensional Hilbert spaces.

II. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we present a series of results concerning sums of product operators. Recall that the Schmidt rank [2] of an operator $\mathcal{S}$ is the smallest possible number of product operators that can be summed to obtain $\mathcal{S}$. We begin with

Theorem 1. *If there exists a set of nonzero coefficients, $\{c_j\}$, such that the linear combination*

$$\mathcal{S} = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j A_j \otimes B_j \tag{7}$$

has Schmidt rank r_s, then

$$\delta_A + \delta_B \leq N + r_s, \tag{8}$$

where δ_A is the dimension of the space spanned by operators $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^N$, and similarly for δ_B.

The proof is somewhat involved, so we defer it to the appendix. Setting $r_s = 1$, we have the immediate corollary,

Corollary 2. *If there exists a set of nonzero coefficients, $\{c_j\}$, such that the linear combination*

$$\mathcal{S} = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j A_j \otimes B_j \tag{9}$$

has Schmidt rank 1 and so is a product operator, then

$$\delta_A + \delta_B \leq N + 1. \tag{10}$$

This result was found previously, appearing as proposition 3 in [3] (this proposition is stated in terms of sums of product pure states instead of product operators, but see section III C, below, for a discussion of the close relationship between these contexts).

We can generalize this result to any number of parties by simply writing it for each pair of parties and then summing the resulting inequalities, obtaining $\sum_{\alpha=1}^P \delta_\alpha \leq P(N+1)/2$, see the discussion in section IV. However, we can do better by using the following well-known lemma, the proof of which we include for completeness.

Lemma 3. *If operators $\{R_j\}_{j=1}^N$ span a space of dimension δ_R, then with $Q_j \neq 0\ \forall j$, operators $\{R_j \otimes Q_j\}_{j=1}^N$ span a space of dimension no less than δ_R.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that operators $\{R_j \otimes Q_j\}_{j=1}^N$ span a space of dimension $\hat{\delta} < \delta_R$. Then, ordering the set so the first δ_R of the R_j are linearly independent, we have that there exist coefficients c_j not all zero such that

$$0 = \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{\delta}+1} c_j R_j \otimes Q_j. \tag{11}$$

Linear independence of the set $\{R_j\}_{j=1}^{\hat{\delta}+1}$ appearing in this expression implies $c_j = 0 \ \forall j$, a contradiction, completing the proof. ■

From this lemma, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Given a set of product operators for P parties, $\{\mathcal{M}_j = M_j^1 \otimes \ldots \otimes M_j^P\}_{j=1}^N$, if there exists a set of nonzero coefficients, $\{c_j\}$, such that the linear combination $\mathcal{S} = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \mathcal{M}_j$ is a product operator, then for each pair of parties α, β,*

$$\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta \leq N + 1, \tag{12}$$

where δ_α is the dimension of the space spanned by operators $\{M_j^\alpha\}_{j=1}^N$.

Proof. Consider a bipartite split $A|B$ of the P parties, with party α on side A and party β on the other side, B. Then, by lemma 3, $\delta_A \geq \delta_\alpha$ and $\delta_B \geq \delta_\beta$. The theorem follows directly, since $\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta \leq \delta_A + \delta_B \leq N+1$, where the second inequality is just corollary 2. ■

Theorem 4 leads immediately to the following observation.

Corollary 5. *Every subspace spanned by a set of product operators is devoid of any other product operator unless there is a subset of the original set of product operators that satisfies* (12) *of theorem 4 for every pair of parties, α, β.*

The results for $r_s = 1$ can be strengthened. Let $\widehat{\delta}$ be the dimension of the space spanned by product operators $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^N$. Then,

Theorem 6. *If the set of product operators $\{\mathcal{M}_j = \otimes_{\alpha=1}^P M_j^\alpha\}_{j=1}^N$ is linearly dependent so that $\widehat{\delta} < N$, and if $\mathcal{S} = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \mathcal{M}_j$ with $\mathcal{S}$ a product operator, then for each pair of parties α, β,*

$$\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta \leq \widehat{\delta} + 1 < N + 1. \tag{13}$$

It is clear from this that we can simply replace N by $\widehat{\delta}$ in both corollaries 2 and 5.

Proof. Choose indexing of the $\mathcal{M}_j$ such that $\{\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{M}_{\widehat{\delta}}\}$ are linearly independent. Then, for $j > \widehat{\delta}$, $\exists \{c_{ji}\}$ such that

$$M_j^1 \otimes M_j^2 \otimes \ldots \otimes M_j^P = \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\delta}} c_{ji} M_i^1 \otimes M_i^2 \otimes \ldots \otimes M_i^P, \tag{14}$$

which tells us that the sum on the right-hand side is a product operator. Hence, theorem 4 immediately implies that for every pair α, β, $\delta'_\alpha + \delta'_\beta \leq \widehat{\delta} + 1$, where δ'_α is the dimension of the span of the first $\widehat{\delta}$ of the M_j^α, and similarly for δ'_β. However, from (14), multiplying by $M_j^{2\dagger} \otimes \ldots \otimes M_j^{P\dagger}$, and taking the partial trace over all parties except the first one, we see that M_j^1, $j > \widehat{\delta}$, lies in the span of the first $\widehat{\delta}$ of the M_i^1, which implies that $\delta'_1 = \delta_1$. A similar argument shows that $\delta'_\alpha = \delta_\alpha \ \forall \alpha$, which completes the proof. ■

In the following section, we will focus on the simpler theorem 4 instead of the stronger theorem 6, the former being easier to apply because of the fact it only requires that one count distinct operators $\mathcal{M}_j$ without having to know anything about the span of that set of product operators.

III. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we give a few examples of how the results of the previous section can be applied in the field of quantum information theory.

A. When a set of product operators can represent a quantum channel

Our first suspicion about results of the type presented in this paper arose from a study of measurement protocols implemented by many parties on spatially separated subsystems, in which the parties perform local quantum operations and communicate classical information to each other, a common paradigm in quantum information theory known as LOCC. It is well known that every LOCC protocol implements a separable operation (a separable quantum channel), which means that the operators that have been implemented by the parties once the end of the protocol is reached are product operators. It is also well known that there exist separable operations that cannot be implemented by LOCC [4].

Consider a bipartite LOCC protocol that implements Kraus operators $K_j = A_j \otimes B_j$ corresponding to positive operators $\mathcal{M}_j = K_j^\dagger K_j = \mathcal{A}_j \otimes \mathcal{B}_j$, with $\mathcal{A}_j = A_j^\dagger A_j$ and $\mathcal{B}_j = B_j^\dagger B_j$. Since this must be a (complete) separable operation, we require that

$$I_A \otimes I_B = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{A}_j \otimes \mathcal{B}_j, \tag{15}$$

with I_A, I_B the identity operators on the respective party's Hilbert space. From the results of [5], it is straightforward to argue that if the $\mathcal{A}_j$ are linearly independent, then in order that an LOCC protocol for this set of operators exists, it must be that every $\mathcal{B}_j$ is proportional to I_B. Then, $\delta_A = N$, $\delta_B = 1$, and $\delta_A + \delta_B = N + 1$. Other considerations led us to conjecture that no LOCC protocol exists unless $\delta_A + \delta_B \leq N + 1$. Initially, we hoped that this might provide a way to differentiate those sets of product operators that constitute separable operations that are not LOCC from those sets that are LOCC. However, from the results of the previous section and the fact that (15) is a sum of N product operators that is equal to a product operator, we see that this bound is satisfied by every separable operation, not just those that are LOCC. Theorem 4 generalizes this idea to any number of parties, providing the following necessary condition on the positive operators corresponding to a separable operation on any multipartite system.

Theorem 7. *If a set of product operators $\{\mathcal{M}_j = \otimes_{\alpha=1}^{P} M_j^\alpha\}_{j=1}^N$ on P parties constitutes a Kraus represention of a separable operation, then it must be that dimensions δ_α of the spans of local operator sets $\{M_j^{\alpha\dagger} M_j^\alpha\}_{j=1}^N$ satisfy $\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta \leq N + 1$ for each pair of parties α, β.*

B. Uniqueness of product representations for separable quantum channels

An important characteristic of quantum channels is that their representation by Kraus operators is not unique [6]. In general, given a set $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}$ of Kraus operators for a channel, one can obtain a new set as

$$\mathcal{M}_i' = \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \mathcal{M}_j, \tag{16}$$

for any set of complex numbers, u_{ij}, that constitute the elements of an isometry, $\sum_i u_{ij} u_{ik}^* = \delta_{jk}$.[1]

A separable quantum channel is a channel for which there exists at least one set of Kraus operators that are all product operators. In [5], we presented a method for determining whether a given set of (product) Kraus operators can be implemented by LOCC, allowing one to determine if a separable measurement is LOCC. However, in order to answer the important question of when a separable *channel* can be implemented by LOCC, one would need to check all possible Kraus representations for that channel. Clearly, one only need check the *product* Kraus representations, since these are the only representations that can be implemented by LOCC. Unfortunately, however, it is the case that given one such representation, it is not at all obvious how to determine any others, let alone *all* others. It is not even clear how to answer the question of the *existence* of other product representations. Here, we use the results of section II to provide a sufficient condition that a product Kraus representation is unique. In these cases, one can apply the method of [5] to that unique representation to determine if the given separable channel can be implemented by LOCC.

---

[1] If the original set is linearly dependent, it is possible for the new set to have fewer members, in which case the coefficients would not form an isometry. By padding the new set with zero operators, the u_{ij} can always be extended to form a unitary matrix. For our present purposes, however, we will only need the fact that in order for a second set of product Kraus operators representing the same channel to exist, there must be one linear combination of the $\mathcal{M}_j$ that is equal to a product operator.

If the channel is separable, there exists a set of $\mathcal{M}_j$ that are all product operators. Then, for there to exist a different product representation for that channel, the $\mathcal{M}_i'$ in (16) must also be product. From section II, we have that there must be a subset containing $n \geq 2$ of the $\mathcal{M}_j$ that satisfy the conditions of theorem 4. That is, for some such subset, we must have that for every pair of parties α, β,

$$\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta \leq n + 1. \tag{17}$$

Thus, we have

Theorem 8. *If no subset of the product Kraus operators $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}$ containing $n \geq 2$ members exists such that (17) is satisfied for every pair of parties α, β, then that set is the unique set of product Kraus operators representing the given separable quantum channel.*

Note that the δ_α will be different for different subsets, so it will be necessary to check all subsets.

Examples of separable quantum channels that have a unique representation in terms of product Kraus operators are very easy to construct. One such example has every Kraus operator proportional to a product unitary on $P \geq 2$ parties, $\mathcal{M}_j = \sqrt{p_j} U_j^1 \otimes U_j^2 \otimes \ldots \otimes U_j^P$, where $\sum_j p_j = 1$ and each set of local unitaries, $\{U_j^\alpha\}_{j=1}^N$, is a linearly independent set. As a consequence of this linear independence, we see that for every subset of $n \geq 2$ of these Kraus operators, $\delta_\alpha = n \;\forall \alpha$, implying $\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta = 2n > n+1$, violating (17). We note, on the other hand, that this violation is much stronger than necessary, suggesting it may not be too difficult to construct examples for which none of the local operator sets are linearly independent. As an example which is valid for every $P \geq 2$, consider a channel represented by $N = 4$ product Kraus operators, which may be unitaries as in the previous example, and such that there are at least two parties α, β such that their local operator sets satisfy the following two conditions: (1) the span of every two local operators within each of these two sets is two-dimensional, and (2) the span of every three or more local operators within each of these two sets is three-dimensional. Then, $\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta > n + 1$ for every subset ($n \leq N$), and this representation is therefore unique. A specific example is a two-qubit channel with Kraus operators proportional to $I \otimes I$, $\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x, \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y$, and $(I + i\sigma_x + i\sigma_y) \otimes (I + i\sigma_x + i\sigma_y)$.

It turns out that additional examples can be easily found for the case of more than two parties. In fact, starting from any separable channel, one can construct others that have unique representations in terms of product Kraus operators. One way to do this is as follows: start with a separable quantum channel represented by a set of N Kraus operators K_j, which are product operators acting on P parties. Choose two sets of N linearly independent unitaries acting on two other parties, $\{U_j^1\}$ and $\{U_j^2\}$, and create a new set of Kraus operators defined as $\mathcal{K}_j = U_j^1 \otimes U_j^2 \otimes K_j$. The set $\{\mathcal{K}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ is a product representation of a separable channel on $P + 2$ parties. From theorem 8, we see that Kraus operators $\{\mathcal{K}_j\}$ are the unique product representation of this new channel. Since we started with an arbitrary quantum channel, this provides a very general method of constructing channels on any number of parties that have unique product Kraus representations.

C. Uniqueness of product state ensembles for separable quantum states

By the Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism [7, 8] between quantum states and quantum channels, the results of the previous section can be carried over directly to quantum states. Instead of representations of quantum channels by sets of Kraus operators, quantum states are represented by ensembles of pure states, usually denoted by kets. Here, again, the representation is not unique, and the unitary (isometric) freedom of representations of quantum channels as given in (16), becomes an equivalent unitary freedom of ensembles representing a quantum state. That is, a quantum state (a density operator) ρ is represented by an ensemble of non-normalized pure states, $\{|\Psi_j\rangle\}$,

$$\rho = \sum_j |\Psi_j\rangle\langle\Psi_j|. \tag{18}$$

The freedom of representation tells us that any other ensemble, $\{|\Psi'_i\rangle\}$, that represents this same state is related to the original one by

$$|\Psi'_i\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}|\Psi_j\rangle, \tag{19}$$

where once again, coefficients u_{ij} constitute the elements of an isometry, $\sum_i u_{ij}u^*_{ik} = \delta_{jk}$, compare (16).[1]

The quantum state is separable if and only if there is an ensemble of pure product states that represents it, $|\Psi_j\rangle = \otimes_\alpha|\psi^\alpha_j\rangle$. As a consequence, all the proofs that we have given for sums of product operators work just as well for states, since the basis of those proofs, given as the proof of theorem 1, begins by reshaping those operators (in matrix representation) into column vectors, and those column vectors can just as well correspond to the kets that represent the product pure states of an ensemble for ρ. Then, recognizing (19) as a sum of product kets equal to a product ket (compare to the previous section's (16) as a sum of product operators equal to a product operator), we have

Theorem 9. *If in a product ensemble $\{|\Psi_j\rangle\}$ representing separable state $\rho = \sum_j |\Psi_j\rangle\langle\Psi_j|$ on any number of parties, no subset of the product pure states $|\Psi_j\rangle$ containing $n \geq 2$ members exists such that* (17) *is satisfied for every pair of parties α, β, then that ensemble is the unique product ensemble representing the given separable quantum state. Note that here, δ_α is the dimension of the span of the local kets $\{|\psi^\alpha_j\rangle\}_j$ for party α of the product states $|\Psi_j\rangle$ in the given subset.*

This result generalizes earlier ones [9–11], where a special case of this theorem was proven for bipartite states and representations in which one of the two sets of local parts $\{|\psi^\alpha_j\rangle\}_j$ is linearly independent. Here, our theorem is valid for any number of parties, and as is shown above for the case of quantum channels, it encompasses ensembles for which no local set is linearly independent (the second example given above for channels can be carried over to this case of quantum states). Furthermore, from the discussion in the last paragraph of the previous subsection, we have a method to construct examples of separable states on any number of parties for which there is a unique product ensemble representation.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have presented a series of conditions for when a sum of product operators can be a product operator. We have also discussed how the simplest of these addresses questions in quantum information theory, examples including conditions on (1) when a set of product operators can represent a separable quantum channel, (2) when a set of product operators is a unique product representation of a separable quantum channel, and (3) when an ensemble of product states is the unique product ensemble representing a separable quantum state. For the latter two cases, we have described entire classes of channels (states) that have a unique representation in terms of product Kraus operators (product kets).

Our results for more than two parties are restricted to merely applying the bipartite result to every pair of parties, and it is natural to wonder if there exists a stricter characterization of sets of product operators that sum to product operators in the case of many parties. One can show that without imposing further constraints on the set of product operators, then it is definitely not possible to find a stricter characterization. This is seen from the following (admittedly rather contrived) example,

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{M}_1 - \mathcal{M}_1 + \mathcal{M}_2 - \mathcal{M}_2 + \ldots + \mathcal{M}_n - \mathcal{M}_n, \tag{20}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{S} = S^1 \otimes \ldots \otimes S^P$, $\mathcal{M}_j = M^1_j \otimes \ldots \otimes M^P_j$, and local operator sets $\{S^\alpha, \{M^\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^n\}$ are linearly independent for each α. Then, $N = 2n+1$, $\delta_\alpha = n+1\ \forall\alpha$, and for every pair of parties α, β our upper bound is tight: $\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta = 2(n+1) = N+1$. Note that this leads to $\sum_\alpha \delta_\alpha = P(N+1)/2$, saturating another bound that can be directly obtained from the bipartite results. We do not know if a stricter characterization is possible for $P > 2$ even by only excluding cases such as this that have proper subsets of the N product operators summing to zero. We suspect, however, that if this is done the bound of $\delta_\alpha + \delta_\beta \leq N+1$ may be far from tight for at least one, and likely for many, of the α, β pairs. It does appear that in many cases, including all our preliminary efforts with random numerical searches that exclude proper subsets summing to zero, the far stricter bound of $\sum_\alpha \delta_\alpha \leq N+P-1$ is obeyed, and it would be interesting to find conditions under which this stricter bound is valid.

Acknowledgments — I thank Vlad Gheorghiu and Li Yu for helpful comments. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation through Grant No. PHY-1205931.

Appendix: Proof of theorem 1

Proof. Reshape each operator A_j (in matrix representation) into a column vector by stacking successive columns of A_j each on top of the previous one. Collect these column vectors together to form the columns of a new d_A^2-by-N matrix, $\mathcal{A}$, and do the same thing with the B_j to form the d_B^2-by-N matrix $\mathcal{B}$. Define diagonal N-by-N matrix $\mathcal{C}$ with diagonal elements c_j, and denote the reshaped version of S as the d_B^2-by-d_A^2 matrix $\mathcal{S}$. Then (7) takes the reshaped form,

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{A}^T, \tag{A.1}$$

where $\mathcal{A}^T$ is the transpose of $\mathcal{A}$. Noting that the rank $\mathrm{Rn}(XY)$ of a matrix product XY satisfies the inequality [12],

$$\mathrm{Rn}(XY) \geq \mathrm{Rn}(X) + \mathrm{Rn}(Y) - l, \tag{A.2}$$

where l is the inner dimension of the matrices (X is m-by-l and Y is l-by-n), we see that

$$\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{S}) \geq \mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{B}) + \mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{A}) - N, \tag{A.3}$$

where we have used the fact that $\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{C}) = N$, since the c_j are assumed to be nonzero. Now, $\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{A})$ is the number of linearly independent (reshaped) operators A_j, which is just δ_A, and similarly, $\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{B}) = \delta_B$. We next argue that $\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{S})$ is equal to the Schmidt rank of S. To see this, write

$$S = \sum_{k,l,m,n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j (B_j)_{kl} (A_j)_{mn} \right) |km\rangle\langle ln| = \sum_{k,l,m,n} S_{klmn} |km\rangle\langle ln|, \tag{A.4}$$

with $|km\rangle = |k\rangle_B|m\rangle_A$. The reshaped version of this is obtained by turning the bra $\langle l|_B$ into a ket and the ket $|m\rangle_A$ into a bra. Then,

$$\mathcal{S} = \sum_{k,l,m,n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j (B_j)_{kl} (A_j)_{mn} \right) |kl\rangle\langle mn| = \sum_{k,l,m,n} S_{klmn} |kl\rangle\langle mn| = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{S})} \left(\sum_{kl} (b_i)_{kl} |kl\rangle \right) \left(\sum_{kl} (a_i)_{mn} \langle mn| \right), \tag{A.5}$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of rank, with sets of vectors $\{a_i\}$ and $\{b_i\}$ each spanning a space of dimension $\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{S})$. Identify $S_{klmn} = \sum_i (a_i)_{mn} (b_i)_{kl}$ and insert this into (A.4) to obtain

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{S})} \sum_{k,l,m,n} \left[(a_i)_{mn} |m\rangle\langle n| \right] \otimes \left[(b_i)_{kl} |k\rangle\langle l| \right]. \tag{A.6}$$

Noting the dimension of the spans of each set, $\{a_i\}$ and $\{b_i\}$, it is not difficult to show that $\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{S})$ is the smallest number of product vectors by which S can be expanded, from which we see that indeed, $\mathrm{Rn}(\mathcal{S})$ is the Schmidt rank of S. Hence from (A.3), we have the desired result, $\delta_A + \delta_B \leq N + r_s$. ■

---

[1] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations* (Spring-Verlag, Berlin, 1983).
[2] J. Tyson, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **36**, 10101 (2003).
[3] S. Wu, Phys. Lett. A **321**, 301 (2004).
[4] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, , and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1070 (1999).
[5] S. M. Cohen, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 052322 (2011).
[6] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).
[7] A. Jamio*l*kowski, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 275 (1972).
[8] M.-D. Choi, Lin. Alg. Appl. **10**, 285 (1975).
[9] E. Alfsen and F. Shultz, Journal of Mathematical Physics **51**, 052201 (2010).
[10] K. Kirkpatrick, Journal of Mathematical Physics **43**, 684 (2002).
[11] K.-C. Ha and S.-H. Kye, arXiv: quant-ph/1210.1088v3 (2012).
[12] R. Horn and C. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985).